To: Hedrick, Elizabeth[Hedrick.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Tingley, Kevin[Tingley.Kevin@epa.gov]; Allgeier, Steve[Allgeier.Steve@epa.gov]
From: Travers, David
Sent: Sun 1/12/2014 12:13:41 AM
Subject: Re: Eastman MCHM Method

Thanks E. If worthwhile, please forward to Morley. I can't opine on the Eastman method (sounds as if dupont is the other method?), but may be informative for them to know about the CT lab. D

From: Hedrick, Elizabeth
Sent: Saturday, January 11, 2014 6:14:25 PM
To: Allgeier, Steve
Cc: Travers, David
Subject: Eastman MCHM Method

Couldn't resist doing a quick bit of research.

· The Eastman method **is not** a quantitative method. They cite difficulty in obtaining pure materials. It is a percent purity method that uses relative areas of target and impurity peaks assuming the same detector response factors. If there is not a better method that everyone could agree to use, water labs would likely perform a multi-point calibration from a stock standard with at least a nominal concentration. The method calls for DMF extraction. DMF (nasty solvent) is not a common solvent for DW labs which could delay ready implementation of the method.

· Neither methylcyclohexane methanol or 1,4-Cyclohexanedimethanol are cited in SAM or WCIT.

· Many fixed water/drinking water labs in Lab Compendium have GC-FID instrumentation and can analyze for VOCs. One WLA mobile lab found with required instrumentation; Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, Mobile Analytical Laboratory.

Elizabeth

Water Security Division

Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

26 West Martin Luther King Drive

MS 140

Cincinnati, Ohio 45268

Ph (513) 569-7296

Fax (513) 569-7191